

**MTCA Science Advisory Board
Minutes from November 16, 2001 Meeting
@ USEPA Office in Seattle**

Board Members Present: Dr. Richelle Allen-King; Dr. Bruce Duncan; Dr. Elaine Faustman; Dr. Hank Landau; Dr. Marjorie Norman

Ecology Staff Present: Pete Kmet; Dawn Hooper; Curtis Dahlgren; Hun Seak Park; Charles San Juan; Michael Feldcamp

Others Present:

Annual Meeting

Chair Landau welcomed members and thanked them for their continued participation. He reflected on the events of September 11th and noted the importance of the freedom in the U.S. to express opinions on issues.

Chair Landau also noted that this was his 13th year on the Board and that Bruce, Richelle and Marjorie had served 5 years and Elaine was in her 2nd year.

In reviewing the Charter, Chair Landau noted that the Board is intended to make recommendations to Ecology by consensus. He also stressed the importance of Board members providing unbiased advice. The Board members then described any potential conflicts of interest as follows:

Dr. Landau is a private consultant (Geosphere) and has done work for both business and government clients and well as environmental groups. He noted he is a member of several environmental groups.

Dr. King is a professor at Washington State University. In this capacity, receives funding from several national scientific organizations. Also has occasionally worked as a consultant for businesses, although is not currently retained.

Dr. Duncan is an employee of the USEPA, Region 10.

Dr. Faustman is a professor at the University of Washington. In this capacity receives funding from several federal agencies. Is currently working on risk issues at the Hanford site. Also is doing consulting work for 2 businesses on non-cleanup issues.

The Board then reviewed and approved the draft fact sheet. Dawn noted this could be used as the Board's annual report to the Director.

Rule Overview

Curtis Dahlgren presented a general overview of the MTCA rule revisions. He noted that Ecology had provided several rule training sessions throughout the State and that these had been well-attended. Some points of discussion of note:

There was considerable discussion on the TPH contaminated soil end use criteria. The Board expressed the concern that the Solid Waste Program coordinate with the Cleanup Program so these criteria do not result in the creation of additional contaminated sites.

Elaine noted she was doing work on the long term effectiveness of institutional controls and would be interested in accessing Ecology's institutional control database.

Hank suggested that once the citizen technical advisor was hired, the Board would be interested in meeting this individual and learning of issues raised by the public.

Pete Kmet presented an overview of the process for setting cleanup standards for the various media. He highlighted areas that the Board had commented on as well as noted issues with the most questions from the public and Ecology staff.

Bruce expressed concern that surface water cleanup levels need to take into account sediment impacts. He expressed concern that Ecology had withdrawn the freshwater sediment cleanup standards and requested this issue be brought before the Board for discussion at a future meeting.

Hank also expressed concern that the Method A ground water and soil cleanup level table values do not directly take into account surface water impacts. As a result, this may not get taken into account when these Method A cleanup levels are established. The Board then discussed the potential need to establish a table in CLARC that addresses situations where surface water is impacted.

Bruce asked if the surface water standards take into account the potential for contamination of a drinking water aquifer by surface water recharge. Pete indicated that if the surface water is classified as a potential source of drinking water this would be taken into account since the surface water standard would have to be as stringent as the drinking water standards.

Elaine noted that dust particles are not directly considered in setting soil cleanup levels. She said studies are showing that fine diesel particulate matter is of concern and that dust may need to be taken into account in the future.

Charles San Juan provided an overview of the new Section 747. During this discussion Elaine noted that the calculation of noncarcinogen ground water cleanup levels may not be sufficiently protective of an adult pregnant women. Marjorie noted that the approach uses EPA's current hierarchy for reference doses, and that developmental/other effects are either incorporated into the value or can be considered qualitatively. They both agreed that when developmental reference doses are issued, this aspect of the rule may need to be revisited..

Hun Seak Park described the workbook tools he has developed to facilitate cleanup level calculations. The Board noted these were very impressive and should greatly facilitate implementation of MTCA.

Overview of Current and Projected Future SAB Issues

Pete Kmet presented a draft "short list" of future SAB issues. He noted that Ecology staff were currently working on the following issues and these will likely be the first brought to the Board for discussion next Spring:

- TPH surface water cleanup levels
- TPH soil bioassay work
- Fate & Transport issues
- Natural attenuation guidance
- TPH guidance

The Board concurred with this short list of issues, but added the following issues to the longer list needing future discussion:

- How to evaluate if a ground water cleanup level will result in sediment contamination.
- Freshwater sediment standards
- Standards for protection of wetlands
- Prediction of ground water impacts due to biodegradation of TPH
- Consideration of other toxicological endpoints such as developmental toxicity when setting cleanup levels
- How to calculate cleanup levels when there is information on both finfish and shellfish consumption rates
- Fish diet fraction
- TPH contaminated soil end use criteria
- How to factor in depletion of contamination over time when establishing cleanup levels
- Implications of the National Academy of Sciences report on the toxicity of arsenic

Also, Elaine noted that EPA may be moving away from using the IEUBK model to determine soil lead cleanup levels and that Ecology should check this out before proceeding with a lot of work on this model.

Area-wide Contamination Task Force

Dawn Hooper described this task force, noted some of the Area-Wide issues that may be referred to the SAB for consideration and requested feedback on whether the Board was interested in being a member of this task force. The Board asked for more information about the Area-wide Workgroup functions. Ecology committed to presenting an Area-wide briefing shortly after the first Task Force meeting. This briefing will likely occur in February.

After considerable discussion, members agreed that the Board be available as a resource on technical issues that come out of the task force discussions and that if any individual SAB member interested in serving on the Taskforce could pursue membership. Marjorie Norman indicated that she is interested but would like to learn more about the project and expectations for Task Force members. Dawn Hooper will provide Marjorie with more information.

In the process of reviewing the materials describing the task force, the Board noted that the proposed subcommittee structure for the task force does not appear to address human health risk issues. Dawn noted that human health risk issues are within the scope of the "Protective Measures" subcommittee and agreed that the materials will be clarified to indicate this.

Also, Hank and Richelle indicated that the potential for contamination of ground water by leaching from arsenic contaminated soils should be evaluated.

Future Meetings

Ecology expects to have 4 to 6 SAB meetings next year, with the first one likely in February. Board members expressed the concern that tentative dates for these meetings be established soon.

Minutes prepared by Pete Kmet.

SAB Minutes 11.16.01